



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

WHT
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/066,318	02/01/2002	Pietro Perona	06618/776001/CIT 3395	9800
20985	7590	08/22/2006	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON, PC P.O. BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			STREGE, JOHN B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2624	

DATE MAILED: 08/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/066,318

Applicant(s)

PERONA ET AL.

Examiner

John B. Strege

Art Unit

2624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 August 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5-9,11,12,15-23,25,26 and 28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5-9,11,12,15-23,25,26 and 28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 January 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Response to Amendment

1. The amendment received 8/14/06 has been entered in full. Due to the amendment the 112 rejections have been withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 8/14/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Specifically the Applicant argues that Basri does not teach or suggest ignoring features that are not within the homologous parts. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Specifically Basri discloses "our computations are essentially local, in the sense that only similarities between pairs of images that resemble each other matter for the computation" (last paragraph of the conclusion). Thus Basri discloses using only similar features to form a model.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1,5,7,9,17-20, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Basri et al. *Clustering appearances of 3D objects* (hereinafter "Basri").

Regarding claim 17, Basri discloses an article comprising: a machine readable medium which stores machine-executable instructions, the instructions causing a machine to: automatically analyze a plurality of training images (see the abstract, first paragraph of the introduction, and the paragraph beginning on line 7 of column 2 on the

first page); establish correspondence between homologous parts in the plurality of training images (paragraph beginning on line 25 of column 2 on the first page); and automatically form a model for further recognition of said specified feature, using said selected features (first paragraph of the introduction), and ignoring other features that are not in said set of homologous parts (last paragraph of the conclusion).

Regarding claim 18, Basri discloses using eigenvectors to reduce the number of detected features (section 4.1, eigenvalues are read as vector quantization).

Regarding claim 19, Basri discloses probabilistically estimating which of the features are most informative for the model (section 4.2).

Regarding claim 20, Basri discloses instructions to assemble a matrix of feature candidate positions indicating possible relevant parts, and statistically assessing whether said relevant parts are likely to be useful (section 4.2).

Regarding claim 22, Basri discloses forming a model using a plurality of the recognized parts (first paragraph of the introduction).

Regarding claim 1, Basri discloses a method, comprising: analyzing a plurality of images which includes a specified desired feature therein to select a plurality of selected features (see the abstract, first paragraph of the introduction, and the paragraph beginning on line 7 of column 2 on the first page); and automatically detecting features within said plurality of images (first sentence of the last paragraph of section 2); automatically forming a model for further recognition of said specified feature, using said selected features (first paragraph of the introduction); and vector quantizing said automatically detected features to reduce the total number of detected

features (section 4.1 discloses eigenvalues, read as vector quantization), and clustering among the vector quantized features, wherein said clustering also includes moving said features to combine similar features which are spatially offset (fourth paragraph of section 3), and using only those similar features to form a model (last paragraph of the conclusion).

Regarding claim 5, Basri discloses probabilistically estimating which of the features are most informative for the model (section 4.1 and 4.2).

Regarding claim 7, Basri discloses assembling a matrix of feature candidate positions indicating possible relevant parts, and statistically assessing whether said relevant parts are likely to be useful (section 4.1-4.3).

Regarding claim 9, Basri discloses forming a model using a plurality of recognized parts (first paragraph of the introduction).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Basri *Clustering appearances of 3D objects* in view of Burl et al. *Recognition of Planar Object Classes* "hereinafter Burl").

Basri discloses automatically determining a model by assessing a function based on part appearance and shape (sections 4.1-4.3). Basri does not explicitly disclose that the function is a joint probability function.

Burl discloses automatically determining a model comprising assessing a joint probability function based on part appearance and shape to insure that the proper deformability is allowed (section 1, column 1, paragraph 2, line 6).

Basri and Burl are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of object clustering.

At the time of the invention it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Basri and Burl to assess a joint probability function. The motivation is that it would insure that the proper deformability is allowed in the model. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Basri and Burl to obtain the invention of claim 6.

7. Claims 8, 11-12, and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Basri *Clustering appearances of 3D objects* in view of Burl *Recognition of Planar Object Classes* and further in view of Jojic et al. U.S. Patent 6,701,016 (hereinafter called Jojic).

Regarding claim 8, Burl nor Basri reveal the features of this claim. However, Jojic reveals the following:

A method wherein said joint probability function (col. 13, lines 3-5) is estimated using expectation maximization (col. 13, lines 51-54).

Burl and Jojic are analogous art because they both describe statistical models for pattern recognition. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the methods of Burl and Jojic because expectation maximization is a well-known optimization method which is effective for graphical models (col. 13, lines 54-56).

Claim 11 is similarly analyzed to claim 8.

Regarding claim 12, Burl discloses using an interest operator on a plurality of images (col. 2 section 2.1, paragraph 1).

Regarding claim 15, Basri discloses estimating which of the features are actually most informative of the desired item to be recognized (section 4.1-4.3).

Claim 16 is similar to claim 8 with the additional limitation that the statistical analysis establishes a correspondence between homologous parts across the training set of images. Basri discloses this in the paragraph beginning on line 25 of column 2 on the first page.

8. Claim 23,25-26, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burl *Recognition of Planar Object Classes* in view of Matthews USPN 6,633,670, and further in view of Basri *Clustering appearances of 3D objects*.

Regarding claim 23, Burl discloses the following:

An apparatus, comprising: A computer (i.e. SUN Sparc20, section 3, col. 1, paragraph 1, line 10), forming:

A plurality of feature detectors (i.e. N types of features with a detector for each type, section 2.1, paragraph 1, col. 2, lines 3-4), reviewing images to detect parts in the

images (i.e. Local detectors for these features were applied to each image, col. 1, section 3, paragraph 2, lines 2-3) some of those parts will correspond to the foreground as an instance of a target object class (i.e. object distribution, col. 2, section 2.3, paragraph 4, lines 15-16), and other parts not being an instance of the target object class, as part of the background (i.e. background distribution, col. 2, section 2.3, paragraph 4, lines 16-17); and a hypothesis evaluation part, that evaluates candidate locations identified by said plurality of feature detectors, to determine the likelihood of a feature corresponding to an instance of said target object class (i.e. likelihood ratio, equation 14, col. 2, section 2.3, paragraph 4). Furthermore Burl discloses assembling a matrix of feature candidate positions indicating possible relevant parts (i.e. the locations identified by a particular detector are treated as candidates for the actual feature. These can be organized into a data structure W , section 2.1, col. 1, paragraph 2, lines 5-8), and statistically assessing whether said relevant parts are likely to be useful (i.e. From W , we can formulate hypotheses about which of the candidate locations actually constitute an object, section 2.1, col. 1, paragraph 3, lines 1-3).

Burl does not explicitly disclose assigning variables representing the likelihood that the parts in the matrix are from a foreground part or a background part. However it is well known in clustering applications to do so.

Matthews discloses assigning a cluster of pixels to either the foreground or the background (col. 4 lines 40-60).

Burl and Matthews are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of cluster analysis.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Burl and Matthews to assign variables to the background or foreground in the matrix. The motivation for doing so is that it would allow for better classification of the objects.

Burl nor Matthews discloses forming a model based only on foreground parts.

Basri discloses that the computations are essentially local, in the sense that only similarities between pairs of images that resemble each other matter for the computation (last paragraph of the conclusion). This implies that in principle we do not have to compute the similarities between all pairs of images, but to consider only potential candidates that may resemble one another thus reducing the computation required.

Basri, Burl, and Matthews are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of cluster analysis.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Basri, Burl, and Matthews to only use the foreground parts since it would reduce the computation required. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Basri, Burl, and Matthews to obtain the invention of claim 23.

Regarding claim 25, it is inherent that the class with the highest probability would be used to classify the image.

Claims 26 and 28 are similarly analyzed to claims 23 and 25.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.


Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John B. Strege whose telephone number is (571) 272-7457. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday between the hours of 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bhavesh Mehta can be reached on (571) 272-7453. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JS



BHAVESH M. MEHTA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600